



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,297	10/22/2003	Geary G. Parke	107725/00006	2242
7590	11/09/2005		EXAMINER	
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone P.L.C. c/o Robert Kelley Roth Suite 2500 150 West Jefferson Ave. Detroit, MI 48226			CINTINS, IVARS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1724	
DATE MAILED: 11/09/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/691,297	PARKE, GEARY G.
	Examiner Ivars C. Cintins	Art Unit 1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-12 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-12, in the reply filed on August 29, 2005 is acknowledged. Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 13-16 are withdrawn from further consideration, as being directed to a non-elected invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation that the phosphate in the second trap is "insoluble" (claim 7, last line) does not appear to be supported by the disclosure originally filed, and hence constitutes **new matter**. Furthermore, the limitation that the phosphate "has a particle size greater than a mesh of 20/60" (claim 9, lines 2-3) does not appear to be supported by the disclosure originally filed, and hence also constitutes **new matter**.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The particle size represented by the term "mesh of 20/60" (claim 9, line 3) is not readily apparent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casolo in view of Hong (U.S. Patent No. 5,665,240). Casolo discloses an apparatus comprising an inlet connected to a metals trap (24, 28, 32, 36, 40 and/or 44), and a second trap (20) positioned between the inlet and the metals trap, which second trap filters organic materials from wastewater. Accordingly, this primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited phosphate material. Hong discloses removing contaminants from water with calcium phosphate (see col. 3, line 17); and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the system of Casolo with a calcium phosphate treatment unit, as suggested by Hong, in order to provide additional contaminant removal capability for this primary reference system.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casolo and Hong as applied above, further in view of Szczepanik (U.S. Patent No. 4,902,427). The modified primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited bone char. Szczepanik discloses removing contaminants from water with bone char; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the system of the modified primary reference with a bone char treatment unit, as suggested by Szczepanik, in order to provide additional metal contaminant removal capability for this modified primary reference system.

Claims 1-6 and 10-12 are allowed because the references of record do not teach or fairly suggest an adsorption apparatus of the type recited wherein the second trap contains fish bone char.

Applicant's arguments filed May 23, 2005 have been noted and carefully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive of patentability. Applicant argues that Hong discloses a "slightly soluble phosphate" and does not teach the recited insoluble phosphate. It is pointed out, however, that the only specific phosphate material disclosed by Applicant in the specification is calcium phosphate (see page 8, line 17); and therefore, the calcium phosphate of Hong (see col. 3, line 17; and col. 4, line 37) will inherently have the same solubility characteristics as Applicant's calcium phosphate.

Moncada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,316,055) and Bennett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,626,359) disclose purifying liquids with bone char.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is 571-272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at 571-272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Ivars Cintins*  
Ivars C. Cintins  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins  
November 7, 2005